DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 389 022 CS 509 080

AUTHOR Dunbar, Norah E.
TITLE Conversational Analysis of Cross Examination in Intercollegiate Debate: Using a Model of Relational Control.
PUB DATE Nov 95
NOTE 33p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Speech Communication Association (81th, San Antonio, TX, November 18-21, 1995).
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Communication Research; *Debate; *Debate Format; Discourse Analysis; Higher Education; *Interpersonal Communication; Pilot Projects
IDENTIFIERS Cross Examination Debate Association; *Relational Models

ABSTRACT

A pilot study examined whether a relational control model can be used to evaluate cross examination in academic debate. Four cross examination periods in the 1994 Cross Examination Debate Association Nationals final round were videotaped, transcribed, and coded (using the Relational Communication Control Coding Scheme). Results indicated that the same types of assertions and questions that exist in interpersonal conversations also exist in cross examination and the basic premise of relational control is the same. Results also indicated that the context of cross examination seemed to be close enough to the interpersonal communication context that the model was useful. Future research should look at other contexts which the study of relational control can be applied to, in addition to further studies in cross examination. (Contains 34 references and 2 tables of data.) (RS)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 389 022

Conversational Analysis of Cross Examination in Intercollegiate Debate: Using a Model of Relational Control

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

N. Dunbar

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

Norah E. Dunbar

Department of Communication Arts and Sciences

California State University, Chico

Speech Communication Association Annual Convention

November, 1995

San Antonio, Texas

CS509080

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Conversational Analysis of Cross Examination in Intercollegiate Debate:

Using a Model of Relational Control

The practice of cross examination in intercollegiate debate is certainly not a new idea. In fact, cross examination in debate has been in use for some time, however, it is evident that the knowledge debaters and coaches have about the process of cross examination is still quite limited. For example, there are few comprehensive theories on the subject and so coaches have a difficult time teaching the art of cross examination and it is rarely used by debaters to its full strategic potential. In addition, little has been written in the field on cross examination. Since the CEDA Yearbook (the journal of the Cross Examination Debate Association) was first published in 1980, only four articles have been published on the subject in that journal. Even after the adoption of cross-examination in the National Debate Tournament (NDT), little attention was directed toward teaching cross examination properly. Only one book has ever been published exclusively on cross examination in debate--that of James Copeland in 1981--and most debate texts only dedicate a few pages or a chapter to this difficult and crucial process. More in-depth study into the nature of cross examination could provide us with the insight we need to understand and use this process more fully.

Cross examination is a structured conversation between two people, and so it provides us with a unique opportunity for a rhetorical analysis of dyadic communication. Conversational analysis is a useful tool for analyzing such dyads and thus seems quite useful for evaluating cross examination. The same types of statements and questions that exist in traditional interpersonal conversations are also present in cross examination and the basic premise of relational control is the same. Debaters wish to control cross examination in order to establish credibility and a

strategic advantage over their opponent. This study of cross examination conversations should be well suited to rhetorical analysis since the specialized and public nature of cross examination makes it open for easy scrutiny by others. Transcripts of debates are readily available, and so conducting conversational analysis should not be difficult.

Review of Relevant Literature

My purpose in this paper is to further extend the study of cross examination through a new type of analysis. While the strategic function of cross examination seems to have been lost, relational control has never been used to analyze this process. This is a pilot study to determine whether relational control techniques are in fact appropriate to study cross examination. The literature review will be divided into four main parts. First, I will examine how cross examination in intercollegiate debate became the current debate style. Second, I will discuss lack of strategy that exists within the current use of the process. Third, I will look at the unusual communication situation of the process of cross examination in intercollegiate debating, and the potential use of relational control as a strategy. Finally, research questions for the application of relational control to cross examination in this pilot study will be discussed.

The History of Cross Examination

Gray (1926) introduced the Oregon Plan of debating in an effort to increase the popularity of academic debate for audiences. He proposed that a ten minute period of cross-questioning after each of the twenty-minutes constructive speeches made by affirmative and negative speakers would keep the audience more interested in the debate. Gray found that "the audience is always intensely interested in the periods of cross-questioning and may attend the debates just for this

feature. But the entire debate is interesting because the debaters try to make it so....The audience is both instructed and entertained and they come back for more" (p. 179).

Even in these early trials of cross-questioning, Gray (1926) recognized its benefits. "It requires thorough preparation, skill in keen and quick thinking, ability to make speech adjustments to unusual and unexpected situations, and the ability to establish and maintain a communicative contact with the audience" (1926, p. 180). His early experimentation with cross-questioning revealed benefits for debate that made it attractive for others to study.

At Montana State University, Parker (1932) agreed with Gray's philosophy regarding the benefits of cross-questioning and modified Gray's ideas slightly. He saw the obvious similarities between Gray's cross-questioning and the cross-examination process used in the legal system. As a result, Parker preferred to use the legal term "cross-examination." Parker shortened the constructive speeches to twelve minutes and included four periods of cross-examination so that all four speakers would have a chance to ask questions:

> If the cross-examination affords the valuable training (which it assuredly does), all participants should share in that training. Each speaker should have the opportunity to participate both in the capacity of examiner and examined. More-over, this modification still allows all speakers an opportunity for practice in constructive argument. Each speaker is subjected to cross-examination immediately upon concluding his main speech. (Parker, 1932, p. 100)

Parker's changes in cross-examination were the true start of "cross-examination debate" and closely resembles modern debate as we know it.

Changing from the traditional academic debate format was arduous, but the National Forensic League finally adopted cross-examination in 1952 into standard high-school debate practice. The acceptance of cross-examination at the collegiate level, however, was adopted at a much slower rate (Freshley, 1965). Once guidelines for cross-examination in debate were established, certain members of the college debate community tried to make the practice of cross-examination more widespread. Fuge and Newman (1956), from the University of Pittsburgh, were two such people. They encouraged more colleges who hosted regular tournaments in the Pittsburgh area to include cross-examination tournaments and wrote articles for scholarly journals to "provide thorough and systematic instruction in this difficult technique" (p. 67). They outlined what they believed to be necessary rules for cross-examination including proper delivery, types of appropriate questions and responses, and what should be accomplished through cross-examination.

Freshley (1965) also tried to encourage more schools to teach the cross-examination type of debate. He summarized the advantages of cross-examination including the need for speakers to think on their feet, learn the use of facts, and articulate clearly their point of view in order to prepare them for future careers (usually in law or politics). He summarized that, "if properly taught, cross-examination is superior to the orthodox system. It has most all the advantages of the present system plus the ones noted above" (p. 23). In the years that followed, more coaches and tournament directors began to agree with Freshley (1965) and Fuge and Newman (1956). During the late 1960's and early 70's, for example, cross-examination flourished in U.S. intercollegiate debate.

In 1971, under the direction of Howe, a new debate organization was formed--the Cross-Examination Debate Association (CEDA)--as a reaction against the prevailing form of intercollegiate debate (Schiappa & Keehner, 1990). Although CEDA members' lists of objectives and attitudes toward debate varied widely, the least controversial feature was the inclusion of cross-examination as the standard debate format. CEDA had gradually built support for the wider use of cross-examination, but its influence at the time was limited to the southwestern states (Ziegelmueller, 1983). Soon after the creation of CEDA, the NDT realized the value of cross-examination "because its use is expected to sharpen the contest among arguments in debate...the NDT utilized a cross-examination format for the first time in its history in April, 1976" (Boaz, 1977). At that time, NDT exerted great influence on the practices of other tournaments, and as a result, their use of cross-examination in 1976 meant the rapid acceptance of cross-examination across the country (Ziegelmueller, 1983). With both CEDA, NDT, and virtually all high school tournaments still using cross-examination today in intercollegiate debate, it seems that it is here to stay, but there are still problems with the way cross examination is used today. Specifically, many coaches have agreed that there is a decided lack of strategy in the use of cross examination today (Larson, 1987).

The Lack of Strategy With Cross Examination

Many argumentation instructors and debate coaches have difficulty teaching strategic cross examination to students, which might be due to the lack of literature on the subject.

> Despite the existence of an organization which calls itself the Cross Examination Debate Association, cross examination is still one of the most difficult arts for the debate student to learn...A comprehensive examination of current debate and argumentation texts clearly

> reveals that cross examination remains a largely underdeveloped area of forensics instruction. (Miller & Caminker, 1982, p. 4)

Henderson (1978) was one of the first to seriously address the subject when he suggested the idea of cross-examination be extended to argumentation theory in general: "Few college instructors of argumentation courses recognize cross examination as more than rhetorical embellishment. Yet cross examination should be a basic goal of teaching argument" (p. 112). He articulated one of the first systems of teaching cross-examination to argumentation students. Ziegelmueller (1983) expanded on Henderson's idea by suggesting that cross-examination be taught as it was practiced in debate by making implicit norms and rules explicit:

> Most works on cross-examination advise students to ask only factual questions to which they know the answer and to avoid open-ended questions and undirected "fishing" inquiries. While this advice is generally sound, scrutiny of both the NDT cross-examination and sample cross-examinations offered as models in legal articles and textbooks reveals that, in practice, this advice is often ignored. (p. 898)

Based on his observations of actual debates, Ziegelmueller created a format for teaching cross-examination which focused on how likely the answer to cross examination questions will be what the questioner expects. Ziegelmueller divided the questions into "High Safety Questions", "Medium Safety Questions" and "Low Safety Questions" based on the predictability or "safety" of the responses so that debaters could learn some of the tricks of cross examination which were practiced in tournaments but rarely taught in the argumentation classroom (Ziegelmueller, 1983).

In order to help us better understand the function of cross examination, Simerly and Crenshaw (1991) did an empirical study of several cross examination periods and determined that

there were three different types of questions. The first type is the "X or wh- questions" which generally ask where, when, who, whose, which, what, how. The second type is the "yes/no questions" which are questions asked that expect a yes or no answer, and the third type is "tag questions" which also expect a yes or no answer but are generally declarative statements that are followed by a tag such as "isn't it"? Debaters are taught that cross-examination is a time to ask questions, not make speeches, so they often try to get their point across by making statements and hiding them as questions. This work is the closest to a conversational analysis approach, and provides insight for debaters and coaches for the types of questions which are used.

While effective and strategic ways of using cross examination are not easy to teach to novices, many coaches of advanced debaters are trying to make it more useful. "The greatest challenge to critics of cross-examination has been 'how to teach it' without being there" in the debate round (Berube, 1994, p. 273). Alan Cirlin (1988) feels that any teaching of cross examination is too comprehensive because debaters are unable to employ more than a couple of ideas in any given session. He says, "very little has been written about the fundamental strategic problem which is created by the three minute time limit--specifically, how to use that limited period of time to its best advantage" (Cirlin, 1988, p. 1). Cirlin believes that the process of

> cross-examination is generally acknowledged to be an extremely important and yet an extremely weak element in the average debate. There is a general agreement concerning the theoretical importance of cross-examination, while at the same time coaches tend also to agree that the average quality of cross-examination sessions is quite poor. (Cirlin, 1988, p. 3)

Simerly and Crenshaw (1991) agree:

> The extent to which students effectively utilize cross-examination, no matter what its purpose, is arguable. After more than a few years of participation in the activity as debater, coach, and critic, we feel that the vast majority of participants do not use the cross-examination periods for any strategic advantage. In fact, debaters hardly seem to consider cross-examination as a valuable argumentation tool. (p. 5)

While strides toward teaching cross examination are a positive step, there is another difficulty with cross examination today--it is rarely used for strategic purpose. It would be more beneficial to the students and the activity in general, if we look for a more strategic way of using cross examination.

One of the reasons for the poor quality of cross examination sessions is the fact that cross examination rarely becomes relevant to the outcome of the round. The weaknesses in the opponent's case exposed in cross examination are often not used as arguments in later speeches because the person who speaks next is rarely involved in the cross examination. Norton (1983) says the major problem with cross-examination is that it has become "prep time in drag" because debaters simply use the time to ask meaningless questions while their partners prepare for the next speech. "Even though a strong theoretical case can be built in favor of questioning prior to one's own speech, debaters insist that the practicalities of modern debate--spread debating, briefs, hundreds of pieces of evidence, and primary source checks--make it more convenient to have one's colleague do the questioning" (Copeland, 1981, p. 26). While it is not practical for judges to expect debaters to question immediately before they speak, cross examination should not be a waste of time.

In a survey conducted in 1985 by Suzanne Larson using a Likert-type scale, debate coaches made it apparent that they were dissatisfied with the use of cross examination:

> Responses to the question "Overall in CEDA debate, how would you rate the effectiveness of cross examination" revealed that cross examination as currently practiced, is not very effective. Over half of the respondents awarded the activity a good rating while only 20% of the respondents marked the excellent or the superior category. Respondents were overwhelmingly in disagreement that "Debaters know how to use cross-question effectively" while only 5% of the respondents agreed with this statement. (p. 36)

Clearly, there is a need for some improved strategy in cross examination beyond the simple use of it as extra preparation time. The twelve minutes of cross examination in every round are a way for each team to take control and win extra time for themselves. "Each side is guaranteed twenty-four minutes to speak, and an additional twelve minutes, the cross-exam periods, are 'up for grabs.' The team which is able to 'capture' these minutes for the advancement of its position or the destruction of the opponent's position has won a significant advantage over its opponents" (Copeland, 1981, p. 14-15).

Even though cross-examination has become the norm for intercollegiate debate style, there is still much more to learn. The implications of strategy and technique for cross examination are definitely appreciated by most coaches but sadly under-utilized by debaters. While certain people have tried to develop a way to teach the art of cross examination to debaters, little has actually been done to further the strategic use of cross examination. The use of relational control analysis in these interactions could be a way to help us to further understand the problems.

Relational Control in Cross Examination

Every communication event takes place in a context that Bitzer (1992) refers to as a rhetorical situation: "It seems clear that rhetoric is situational....Virtually no utterance is fully intelligible unless meaning-context and utterance are understood" (p. 3). Each situation is very different and may be either simple or complex. Some situations, like the courtroom or a debate round, are highly structured and often repeated. "From day to day, year to year, comparable situations occur, prompting comparable responses; hence rhetorical forms are born and a special vocabulary, grammar, and style are established" (Bitzer, 1992, p. 13). Cross examination is a rhetorical situation that occurs frequently (four times every debate round) and has highly specialized rules such as controlled time limits, and generally agreed-upon norms about who asks and answers the questions.

The rhetorical situation of cross examination is much more structured than an interpersonal conversation. Most critics of debate would agree that the questioner may only ask questions and the respondent may only answer questions--neither side may make arguments except as part of questions and answers (Cirlin, 1986). It is very frustrating to watch a cross examination session in which the respondent does not answer any questions or responds with more questions, or the questioner makes long statements with no questions. Interpersonal situations on which relational control methods are based are not governed by such rules, but we should be able to study control issues in cross examination through discourse analysis, much like we study interpersonal conversations. There are similarities between cross examination and conversation which support the notion that relational control analysis is appropriate in both circumstances. Debaters are trying to direct, delimit, and define the progress of the cross

examination session despite the fact that they need to operate within certain norms and rules for behavior.

In conversational analysis, we can specifically study interactants in a conversation in a variety of ways in order to understand message exchange (Poole, Folger, & Hewes, 1987). Message exchange is the key to discovering the systematic and orderly properties which are meaningful to the conversants and researchers. Conversation analysts generally focus on understanding the content, function, structure, and effects of conversation (Frey, O'Hair, & Kreps, 1990). Hopper, Koch, and Mandelbaum (1986) describe five subjects that are generally discussed in conversational analysis research:

(1) How do participants in conversation achieve turn-taking?

(2) How do partners accomplish utterance sequences across turns?

(3) How do speakers coordinate talk with gaze, movement, and other action?

(4) How do partners identify and repair problems in interaction?

(5) How does conversation function in particular settings, such as interviews, court hearings, or card games? (p. 169-170)

Even though cross examination is a very different rhetorical situation than interpersonal conversation, some of the same elements exist in both. Cross examination participants are also concerned with turn-taking, sequences of utterances, and other aspects of communication that exist in interpersonal interaction. If the cross examination is not productive, they identify and repair the problems in the interaction. Debaters change their behavior in cross examination for various judges by deciding to sit or stand, and by their choice of questions and so also change their conversation in particular settings. It seems obvious through the application of Hopper,

Koch, and Mandelbaum's five subjects that are discussed in conversational analysis research that both conversation and cross examination have similar goals and so we may be able to use a similar method for evaluating both.

One way to use conversational analysis to study cross examination is to consider relational control. Control is a part of every interpersonal interaction: "relational communication refers to the control aspects of message exchange by which interactors reciprocally define the nature of their relative "position" or dominance in their interaction" (Rogers & Farace, 1975, p. 222) In interpersonal conversation and in cross examination, establishing control is an integral part of the interaction. While trying to get information out, cross examination participants also want to convey their position of dominance in the debate, and establish credibility with the critic by using the "command" aspects of their communication which are directions for action, usually a demand for an answer to a question.

Perhaps the one idea that debaters grasp immediately is that their credibility is on the line with cross examination. No one wants to look like a fool when they are speaking directly to their opponent, and debaters usually want to impress the critic in order to improve their speaker points, or in very close rounds, win the decision on their ethos (Miller & Caminker, 1982). Many texts speak to the "crucial role of cross examination in establishing the credibility of debaters" (Simerly & Crenshaw, 1991, p.3). By using cross examination to make the opponent's logic look flawed, a debater can simultaneously boost her or his own credibility.

Therefore, one of the key components of establishing credibility is maintaining control of the cross examination period. Questioners want to have their questions answered, respondents want to use as much time as possible to re-state their position, and even partners not officially

involved in the cross examination tend to jump in and make sure their partners are answering questions correctly. These days, cross examination can turn into a four-way conversation with all four debaters fighting for control of the interaction, although most debaters still stick to the traditional format with one questioner and one respondent.

In referring to control in interpersonal relationships, Millar and Rogers (1976) say: "The control dimension is concerned with who has the right to direct, delimit, and define, the action of the interpersonal system in the presently experienced spatial-temporal situation" (p. 91). The key aspect of any relational communication is the control aspects of message exchange. Interactants continually define the nature of the interaction by their dominance in their interaction (Rogers & Farace, 1975). Communicators do not necessarily simply state the content of the message when they speak, but also convey information about the relationship itself. "This is another way of saying that communication not only conveys information, but at the same time it imposes behavior....These two operations have been known as the 'report' and the 'command' aspects, respectively, of any communication" (Watzlawick, Beavin, & Jackson, 1967).

The Relational Communication Control Coding Scheme (RCCCS) was developed by Ericson and Rogers (1973) and Rogers and Farace (1975) to study the use of relational control by people in dyadic interactions. Wiemann and Widenmann call this coding scheme "the most well-developed system for the structural analysis of transactions" (1981, p. 12). This method uses a relational communication approach that focuses directly on interaction and is outlined in a number of articles (Ericson & Rogers, 1973; Millar & Rogers, 1976; Millar & Rogers, 1987; Rogers & Farace, 1975). The analysis used in the RCCCS "focuses on message sequences, rather than on

individual message units; on indexing relational control, rather than the content of messages; and on mapping transactional patterns as they unfold over time" (Rogers & Farace, 1975, p. 228).

The emphasis in the RCCCS is on the "command" rather than the "report" aspect of communication, meaning the interactants are not only trying to convey information, but are using commands to impose action. Commands are usually a controlling maneuver. This same type of analysis used in the RCCCS to study conversation can also be used in the study of cross examination since the interactants are both trying to assert their dominance in either a reciprocal or symmetrical way. In interpersonal communication, "there is a similarity of conduct between the two individuals; there is a symmetry of relational control" (Ericson & Rogers, 1973, p. 247). This relational control is also present in cross examination and often has little to do the content of the messages and much to do with the transactional pattern of relational control. For example, due to the increase in the practice of pre-round disclosure where opponents disclose their strategy before the round starts, most debaters are already familiar with their opponents' arguments. In cross examination, they are not always asking questions to find out what their opponents' arguments are, but to enhance their credibility with the judge, trap their opponents, and establish control of the interaction.

The same types of conversational situations in interpersonal discussions that Rogers and Ericson (1973) and Rogers and Farace (1975) examined also exist in cross examination. They delineate 50 different category combinations using the five grammatical forms of questions and nine response modes that are possible in the model (Ericson & Rogers, 1973). Verbalizations are classified as one-up, which assert definitional rights, one-down, which are requests or acceptance of the other's definitional rights, and one-across, which is a leveling maneuver. One-up moves are

control maneuvers such as questions demanding an answer, nonsupport responses, answers with substance, complete statements that initiate an interaction, and all talk-overs except supportive talk-overs. One-down moves include support responses, noncomplete phrases that seek others to take control, and supportive talk-overs. One-across are control-leveling maneuvers such as assertions of extension and noncomplete phrases (Rogers & Farace, 1975). Only one-up moves are associated with control. The interactant with the most one-up moves is generally considered to be the one with the most control in the interaction (Millar & Rogers, 1987). Questions are almost always one-up moves such as those that demand an answer, but questions that seek supportive responses or that continue the dialogue (extension) are coded as one-down moves (Ericson & Rogers, 1973).

The relational control model, however, extends beyond simply coding individual messages as one-up, one-down, or one across, but also allows for transactional analysis. We can look at pairings of messages or even long sequences to determine if patterns exist in the interactions (Rogers & Farace, 1975). Looking at the transaction rather than individual messages is important to relational analysis since the entire interaction can have different control elements than the individual messages. "Sometimes communicators choose to perform speech acts indirectly rather than directly" (McLaughlin, 1984, p. 144). The individual messages may appear to be relinquishing control, but looking at the entire transaction clearly shows the opposite. The two main types of control-defining categories are symmetrical, both parties using one-up or one-down or one-across moves, and complimentary, both using opposite moves. The addition of a third direction, once across, is an attempt to sensitize the control measure because it allows some messages to simply continue the conversation and be coded as neither one-up nor one-down. For

example, any statement that is coded as a "noncomplete extension" of conversation is neither one-up nor one-down because it is an extension of a previous statement that isn't completed. To code it one-up or one-down would be inaccurate, so it is one-across. The one-across direction produces an additional type of symmetry and a third type of transactional exchange--the transitory category (Ericson & Rogers, 1973, p. 257). Symmetry and complementariness help us to understand how the participants each try to control the transactional pattern.

In cross examination, it can be often effective to hide the real goal of the question, since the goal of some questions is to open up the opponent to a future question or argument. These are indirect speech acts in which the speaker does not mean literally what he or she says, are used to set up a strategy (Bierwisch, 1980). Therefore, it is only by examining the overall transaction instead of the individual messages, can we see who, if anyone, has the control in a cross examination interaction. Once it is determined which participant has control and how that control is established, we can more fully understand the situation of cross examination and move towards answering questions about the strategy involved.

Summary and Research Questions

Throughout the history of academic debate, cross examination has become increasingly more prominent in the activity. The Cross Examination Debate Association is now the largest academic debate organization in the United States, but there is still much that we don't know about the cross examination process. Using the relational control model to further study this process can help us teach students to use cross examination more strategically. Relational control should be easily applied to cross examination because the same types of assertions and questions that exist in interpersonal conversations also exist in cross examination and the basic

premise of relational control is the same. For coding control messages, the context of cross examination seems to be close enough to the interpersonal communication context that this model will be useful.

In both cross examination and interpersonal contexts, messages that allow someone else to take control are one-down and messages that attempt to acquire control are one-up. Even though most cross examination periods are attempts to gain control and achieve higher credibility, there must be some relinquishment of control if the time is to be productive at all. At some point, a question must be asked and answered. This context, though it is bound by more rules and norms, is similar to an interpersonal argument--both members want control and to have their point heard.

The relational control model creates the possibility for further study of cross examination. If we can use conversational analysis to understand how control is established in this special rhetorical situation, then perhaps we are on the way to making cross examination a valuable strategic tool for debaters. Once we understand the relationship between control and strategy, cross examination can be used more effectively in academic debate and could prove to make the activity easier to teach, more useful, and more educational for years to come. This leads us to the research question in this study:

RQ: Can relational control be used to evaluate cross examination in academic debate?

Methods

Sample

In order to test the theory of conversational analysis uses for studying cross examination, I examined the four cross examination periods in the 1994 Cross Examination Debate Association Nationals final round transcript, between Johnson and Genco from the University of Missouri at

Kansas City and the hybrid team of Repko and Devereaux from Michigan State and Kansas State Universities. The resolution for Spring 1994 was, Resolved: that US military intervention to foster democratic government is appropriate in the post-cold war world. The affirmative in this particular debate argued that the US should intervene militarily in Haiti, and the negative argued intervention is inappropriate because it threatens our relationship with China.

This is a debate round that has high regard in the CEDA community, as the road to the final round is very difficult and the winners are perceived by many to be the "best" CEDA debaters in the country. As a result, the final round has a large, live audience of debaters from all over the country, it is videotaped, transcribed and sent to all CEDA members, and the practices of the final round are modeled by students who also wish to be in the final round some day. The final round can probably be assumed to have high caliber debaters, and its cross examination might likely be representative of most cross examination that occurs among experienced debaters in the United States.

The videos of the debate rounds are recorded, transcribed, and verified by Patrick M. Jablonski of the University of Alabama.

Procedures

Since this was designed as a pilot study, only the researcher coded the interactions according to the RCCCS developed by Ericson and Rogers (1973) and Rogers and Farace (1975). The transcript was first compared to the video for accuracy, and then coded according to the utterances on the transcript. "The category decisions involve very little inference on the part of the coder" (Ericson & Rogers, 1973, p. 249). Wiemann and Widenmann (1981) found both the inter-coder reliability and intra-coder reliability for this coding scheme to be estimated at .81.

Coding Scheme

The Relational Communication Control Coding Scheme (Ericson & Rogers, 1973; Rogers & Farace, 1975) describes messages in the cross examination periods of debate in terms of control direction. The coding system involves three steps (see table 1). In the first step,

> each utterance of an interaction is assigned a three digit code. The first digit denotes the speaker. The second digit describes the form of the speech. The third digit describes the response mode of the speech. Second-digit category decisions are based only on the message being coded. Third-digit category decisions are based on consideration of the preceding message, as well as the message being coded. In this manner, any two-person communication exchange can be represented by a series of sequentially ordered three-digit codes (Ericson & Rogers, 1973, p. 252).

The code categories under the second digit refer to the form of speech and there are five possible types of utterances. A "talk-over" is any distinguishable interruptive manner of coming into a conversation. Whether a talk-over is successful or not, both messages indicate attempts to control. An "assertion" is any completed referential statement that is not a talk-over. A "question" is any speech, that is not a talk over, which takes interrogative grammatical form. "Noncomplete" utterances are those initiated but not expressed in a complete format such as "Well, I..." or "What I thought was...". The category "other" refers to verbal utterances that are unclassifiable (Ericson & Rogers, 1973).

In the third-digit categories, which refer to how the speech responds to the previous message, there are ten categories. The "support" category refers to the giving and seeking of agreement, assistance, acceptance, and approval. The "nonsupport" code is used for

disagreement, rejection, demands, and challenges. An "extension" is a message that continues the flow or theme of the preceding message, while an "answer" is a response to a question that has substance and/or commitment. To clarify these two categories which have different control-defining natures, a noncommittal response to a question such as "I don't know" is coded as an extension, while a committed response such as "It was July 4th" is coded as an answer (Ericson & Rogers, 1973).

Like extension and answer, some categories are similar but are coded differently. The fifth category, "instruction" is a suggestive statement often accompanied by qualification and clarification such as "I think you should go to bed now because you have to get up early for school." An "order", however, is a more intense, unqualified demand such as "Go to bed." The "disconfirmation" category denotes as message that ignores the request made of the other individual. The response, "Look! It's snowing!" to the question "Where are we going to do eat lunch today?" is a disconfirmation. A "topic change" is similar to disconfirmation, but is a response that has no continuity with the previous messages when no response continuity is requested (Ericson & Rogers, 1973). Farace and Rogers (1975) give this example of a topic change: "Where is tonight's paper?" in response to "The baby is learning to walk."

The last two third-digit codes are simpler. The "initiation-termination" code is a message that begins or attempts to end an interaction. "Other" is a category for any response that is indistinguishable or unclear (Ericson & Rogers, 1973). It is clear that the third-digit categories are more complex than the second-digit categories. "These classifications involve more inference than the previous categories. However, careful delineation of the meaning of each of these

categories lowers the subjectivity of the coding" (Ericson & Rogers, 1973, p.250). The average reliability for the coding procedures was measured at .86 (Ericson & Rogers, 1973).

Table 1: Code categories

1st Digit:	2nd Digit:	3rd Digit:
1= Speaker A	1=Assertion	1=Support
2=Speaker B	2=Question	2=Nonsupport
	3=Talk-over	3=Extension
	4=Noncomplete	4=Answer
	5=Other	5=Instruction
		6=Order
		7=Disconfirmation
		8=Topic change
		9=Initiation-termination
		0=Other

In the second step of the coding process, once the initial coding is completed, the transformation of the data into relational categories is completely determined by the rule system developed by Ericson and Rogers (1973) and Rogers and Farace (1975). One of the three control messages (one-up, one-down, one-across) are assigned to these categories based on whether they are controlling moves, relinquish control, or are levelling maneuvers (see table 2). The first digit is irrelevant to this step because the code translations are the same for both speakers.

In the third step of the coding process, the control direction of individual messages are combined into transaction codes. Symmetrical transaction are paired messages with similar control directions (↑↑, ↓↓, and →→) complementary transactions have a pair of messages with dissimilar control direction (↑↓ and↓↑) , and transitory transactions are paired messages in which one of the messages are one-across (↑→, ↓→, →↑, and →↓) (Rogers & Farace, 1975).

Table 2: Control codes

Second and Third Digit Code Combinations	Type of Control
12, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19 22, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29 32, 33, 34, 35, 36, 37, 38 42, 44, 45, 46, 47, 48 52, 54, 55, 56, 57, 58, 59	one-up ↑
11, 21, 23, 20, 31, 30, 41, 51	one-down ↓
13, 10, 43, 49, 40, 53, 50	one-across →

Analysis

The same types of conversational situations in interpersonal discussions that the RCCCS was designed to examine also exist in cross examination. The purpose in this study was to test the theory that the RCCCS could even be applied to cross examination. I assigned message codes to the individual utterances of each person in the four cross examination periods using the video and transcript. There seemed to be the same type of topics in the model as in the debate and so finding the appropriate codes was relatively easy and I did not find it necessary to create new codes. Next, I assigned the control codes to the message codes (one-up, one-down etc.) and again, the control possibilities seemed to be the same as the RCCCS.

The transactional directions of the RCCCS (symmetry and complementariness) are also present in cross examination, since the goal of some questions is to open up the opponent to a future question or argument. These are indirect speech acts in which the speaker does not mean literally what he or she says, are used to set up a strategy (Bierwisch, 1980). For example, in the

following dialogue from the 1994 CEDA final round, Devereaux asks Genco a simple question in order to open up a future question:

Devereaux: What's a surgical strike?

Genco: It's a strike that uses troops and some air support in order to remove...

Devereaux: How many troops...

Genco: A specified power. Our solvency...

Devereaux: ...and where do they come from? (Jablonski, 1994, p. 8)

While all conversational analysis requires some level of interpretation, it can be reasonably assumed that Devereaux knew what a surgical strike was--one does not debate a topic for four months and become one of the best debaters in the country without this rudimentary knowledge--but he wanted Genco to say that the affirmative's plan was indeed to use troops. He did not literally want the definition of a surgical strike, but was more interested in finding out how many troops the US would need to use for a successful intervention into Haiti. His initial question may not have seemed like it was a controlling question, but the entire interaction sequence displays that he is trying to get Genco to commit to a specified number of troops--a definite one-up move. The RCCCS codes question demaning answers such as this one one-up moves, and so the model seems to produce the same control dimension as does a reflection of Devereaux's purpose.

In a Rogers-style relational analysis of an interaction, patterns of control similarity or dissimilarity between the dyadic members can indicate more about the control in the interaction than looking at isolated messages. In symmetrical transactions, both members of the interaction are trying to exert the same type of control. In one instance of this, Devereaux is asking Genco

about where the troops necessary for the affirmative's proposed intervention into Haiti will come from:

> Devereaux: Would they come from elsewhere?
>
> Genco: I think some of our solvency evidence indicates that they would come from Guantanomo Bay.
>
> Devereaux: Guantanomo Bay. Are they ready? Are they prepared? How quickly could they be there?
>
> Genco: Ah, yes they are. Yes they're prepared and they could be there as quick as we read solvency evidence as soon as you read solvency answers for...
>
> Devereaux: Sure, what about public support before...
>
> Genco: ...we're reading cards in the 1AC that says we could do it in a couple of hours.
>
> Devereaux: I hear ya'. What about public support? (Jablonski, 1994, p. 8)

A series of talk-overs (verbal intervention made while another is talking) occur in this sequence because both men are trying to control the exchange (Ericson & Rogers, 1975). Genco is determined to finish his statement about the readiness of the American military despite the fact that Devereaux has already asked a new question. Devereaux sees Genco is confident about the fact that the military can complete the Haiti mission swiftly so he tries to move Genco to another topic that he may be more vulnerable on--the American support for a Haitian intervention. In this interaction, both men want control of the exchange and so they are competing for control symmetrically. The model codes both of their messages as one-up because Devereaux is asking questions that demand answers and Genco is providing responses with substance.

In complementary transactions, the two interactants are not competing for control, rather, one person relinquishes control and allows the other to define the interaction. In cross examination, this type of dialogue also tends to occur:

Repko: The study was done by the Canadians, right?

Johnston: You're correct.

Repko: And they decided that you could use their force to go in and you'd take 7,000 of them and you could storm into Haiti, right?

Johnston: No, there's 7,500 members of the Haitian army they do not have heavy weaponry. They are not trained, and they do not have support. Their conclusion is any intervention force would be effective. They have no way of defend--standing up against it. The evidence is not specific to Canada, it says any invasion force.

Repko: All right. Now, isn't there a dis--there is a dis--a different historical relationship between the United States and Haiti as there is between Canada...

Johnston: You're correct.

Repko: ...and Haiti, right?

Johnston: You're right...

Repko: The United States...

Johnston: ...the study does not answer the nationalism debate, but my evidence I read down below does.

Repko: All right. So so OK so it doesn't. All right. (Jablonski, 1994, p. 20)

Repko automatically has control with the initiation of the interaction and Johnston does not try to take that away. The goal is to clarify Johnston's position and Johnston agrees with much of what she says, since most of Johnston's answers are support responses such as "you're right" and "you're correct." Repko is making one-up moves and Johnston is answering with one-down moves. In the second question in this example, however, Johnston does disagree with and offers a nonsupport answer (a one-up move) to which Repko agrees (one-down). Near the end of the series, Johnston qualifies his answer about the nationalism debate (another one-up) and again Repko accepts his statement (one-down).

Throughout this exchange, one interactant is offering one up-moves and the other is responding with one-down moves. One person makes a statement that the other person agrees to. Even though each person makes the one-up move at some point in the sequence, it is constant complementary transaction since neither person seems to completely take the control away from the other.

Conclusion

To answer the research question in this study, the relational control model can be quite useful for evaluating cross examination. The same types of assertions and questions that exist in interpersonal conversations also exist in cross examination and the basic premise of relational control is the same. As far as the coding of control messages was concerned, the context of cross examination seemed to be close enough to the interpersonal communication context that this model was useful. There was no need to create new codes or a new translation of the message codes to a control dimension.

In both cross examination and interpersonal contexts, messages that allow someone else to take control are one-down and messages that attempt to acquire control are one-up. Even though most cross examination periods are attempts to gain control and achieve higher credibility, there must be some relinquishment of control if the time is to be productive at all. At some point, a question must be asked and answered. This context, though it is bound by more rules and norms, is similar to an interpersonal argument--both members want control and to have their point heard.

I hope that this examination of the relational control model will create the possibility for further study of cross examination. If we can use conversational analysis to understand how control is established in this special rhetorical situation, then perhaps we are on the way to making cross examination a valuable strategic tool for debaters. A more full understanding of cross examination could prove to make the activity easier to teach, more useful, and more educational for years to come.

For future study, it would be interesting to look at other contexts which the study of relational control can be applied to, in addition to further studies in cross examination. Studies have already been done for husband-wife and other interactions within conjugal couples (Ericson & Rogers, 1973; Rogers & Farace, 1975, Wiemann & Widenmann, 1981), employment interviews (Tullar, 1989), small group interactions (Ellis, 1977), and counseling (Heatherington & Allen, 1984, Erchul, 1987, Frielander & Heatherington, 1989) but there is still many other contexts which are yet to be explored. It would be interesting to look at doctor-patient relationships or parent-child interactions, for example. It would also be interesting to see if the Relational Communication Control Coding Scheme could be adapted to analyze groups with more

than simple dyadic interactions. Even though this coding scheme has existed for more than two decades, there are many more applications for it that have not been explored yet.

References

Berube, D. (1994). Non-policy debating. Lanham, MD: University Press of America.

Bierwisch, M. (1980). Semantic structure and illocutionary force. In J. R. Searle, F. Kiefer, & M. Bierwisch (Eds.), Speech act theory and pragmatics. Boston: D. Reidel Publishing Company.

Bitzer, L. F. (1992). The rhetorical situation. Philosophy and Rhetoric, (Suppl. 1), 1-14.

Boaz, J. (1977). Cross-examination debating. Communication, 6(2), 68-78.

Cirlin, A. (1986). Evaluating cross-examination in CEDA debate: On getting our act together. CEDA Yearbook, 43-50.

Cirlin, A. (1988, November). On the strategy of cross examination. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Speech Communication Association, New Orleans, LA. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 299 645)

Copeland, J. M. (1981). Cross-examination in debate. Stokie, IL: National Textbook Company.

Ellis, D. G. (1977). An analysis of relational communication in ongoing group system. Dissertation Abstracts International, 37(7), 3982A. (University Microfilms No. 76-30, 484)

Erchul, W. P. (1987). A relational communication analysis of control in school consultation. Professional School Psychology, 2(2), 113-124.

Ericson, P. M. & Rogers, L. E. (1973). New procedures for analyzing relational communication. Family Process, 12, 245-267.

Freshley, D. (1965). A case for more cross-examination debating. Journal of the American Forensic Association, 2(1), 21-24.

Frey, L., O'Hair, D., Kreps, G. L. (1990). Applied communication methodology. In D. O'Hair and G. L. Kreps (Eds.), Applied communication theory and research (pp. 23-56). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Friedlander, M. L. & Heatherington, L. (1989). Analyzing relational control in family therapy interviews. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 36(2), 139-148.

Fuge, L. H., & Newman, R. P. (1956, January). Cross-examination in academic debating. Speech Teacher, 5, 66-70.

Gray, J. S. (1926). The Oregon plan of debating. Quarterly Journal of Speech Education, 11(2), 175-180.

Heatherington, L. & Allen, G. J. (1984). Sex and relational communication patterns in counseling. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 31(3), 287-294.

Henderson, B. (1978). A System of teaching cross examination techniques. Communication Education, 27, 112-118.

Hopper, R., Koch, S. & Mandelbaum, J. (1986). Conversation analysis methods. In D. G. Ellis & W. A. Donohue (Eds.), Contemporary issues in language and discourse processes (pp. 169-186). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Jablonski, P. M. (1994). The 1994 Cross Examination Debate Association Final Round Transcript, Evidence, Critiques, and Flowsheet. Alabama: Jablonski.

Larson, S. (1987). Cross-examination in CEDA debate: A survey of coaches. CEDA Yearbook, 33-41.

McLaughlin, M. L. (1984). Conversation: How talk is organized. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Millar, F. E. & Rogers, L. E. (1976). A relational approach to interpersonal communication. In G. R. Miller (Ed.), Explorations in interpersonal communication (pp. 67-86). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Millar, F. E. & Rogers, L. E. (1987). Relational dimensions of interpersonal dynamics. In M. E. Roloff & G. E. Miller (Eds.), Interpersonal processes: New directions in communication research. (pp. 117-139). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Miller, T. H. & Caminker, E. H. (1982). The art of cross examination: An essential skill for debaters and attorneys. CEDA Yearbook, 4-15.

Norton, R. (1983). Remembering what the C.E. stands for: Toward a greater role for cross-examination in CEDA debate. CEDA Yearbook, 29-31.

Parker, D. R. (1932). The use of cross-examination in debate. Quarterly Journal of Speech, 18(1), 97-103.

Poole, M. S., Folger, J. P., & Hewes, D. E. (1987). Analyzing interpersonal interaction. In M. E. Roloff & G. E. Miller (Eds.), Interpersonal processes: New directions in communication research (pp. 220-256). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Rogers, L. E. & Farace, R. V. (1975). Analysis of relational communication in dyads: New measurement procedures. Human Communication Research, 1, 222-239.

Schiappa, E. & Keehner, M. F. (1990). The promise of the Cross Examination Debate Association. Argumentation and Advocacy, 27, 78-85.

Simerly, G. & Crenshaw, A. C. (1991, November). Uses and abuses of cross-examination: Preliminary descriptive analysis and pragmatic considerations of question and answer types in intercollegiate debate. A paper presented at the Speech Communication annual convention, Atlanta, GA. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 339 057)

Tullar, W. L. (1989). Relational control in the employment interview. Journal of Applied Psychology, 74(6), 971-977.

Watzlawick, P., Beavin, J. H., & Jackson, D. D. (1967). Pragmatics of human communication. New York: W. W. Norton & Co.

Wiemann, J. M. & Widenmann, S. J. (1981, May). Self-disclosure and relational control. A paper presented at the annual meeting of the International Communication Association, Minneapolis, MN. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 202 068)

Ziegelmueller, G. (1983). Cross examination re-examined. Argument in transition: Proceedings of the third summer conference on argumentation. Annandale, VA: Speech Communication Association.